

## REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are pending in the instant application. Claims 1-24 have been rejected by the Examiner. Claims 1-24 have been amended. The Applicants submit that claims 1-24 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections. No new matter has been entered.

### **Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §102 and 103**

Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 12-18 and 20-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,996,707 to O'Malley, et al. (hereinafter "O'Malley"). In addition, claims 3, 11 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over O'Malley in view of Official Notice.

Independent claims 1, 9, and 17 have been amended to incorporate features previously recited in claims 6 and 14. Amended claim 1, recites, *inter alia*, “**upon receiving a request** by a voicemail recipient **to access the voice mailbox...presenting the voicemail facsimile notification and options** to a communications device associated with the voicemail recipient, the options including: printing the facsimile; deleting the facsimile from the recipient voice mailbox; storing the facsimile in the recipient voice mailbox for later retrieval; and forwarding the facsimile to a networked fax-capable voice mailbox.”

These features are not disclosed in O'Malley. The Examiner points to Figures 1 and 5 for allegedly teaching these features. However, these portions of O'Malley are not directed to a facsimile-to-voicemail process, but rather, these portions describe how the system differentiates between incoming communications of varying types (Figure 1) and establishing or changing a user profile, which seeks to define how these communications should be handled when received by the system (Figure 5). Accordingly, these portions of O'Malley are not applicable to the Applicants' claimed invention. The portions of O'Malley relevant to the Applicants' claim 1 are Figures 2 (which is directed to conversion of the communication to text) and Figure 4 (directed to notifications to a recipient of a facsimile, which may be converted and presented to a voicemail system). As stated in claim 1, the voicemail facsimile notification is presented, **along with options**, to the voicemail recipient (see, e.g., Applicants' Figure 4). O'Malley teaches the notification is sent to the recipient's voicemail only **after** the system checks a pre-established

user profile to determine which options were selected by the recipient, whereby the options specify how the notification is to be handled. The system then handles the notification in accordance with the user profile, and not in accordance with an option selected by the recipient *at the time the notification is delivered*. Thus, O'Malley is devoid of teaching providing the options along with the notification to the recipient.

In addition, O'Malley fails to disclose an option to delete the voicemail from the voice mailbox. Figure 5 and column 12, lines 45-68 of O'Malley list options selectable by a user; however, there is not a single reference to deleting a voicemail.

For at least these reasons, the Applicants submit that claim 1 is not anticipated by O'Malley and is in condition for allowance. Independent claims 9 and 17 have been amended substantially similar to the amendment made to claim 1. For at least the reasons advanced above, the Applicants submit that claims 9 and 17 are also in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested. Claims 2-8, 10-16, and 18-24 depend from claims 1, 9, and 17, respectively. For at least this reason, the Applicants submit that claims 2-8, 10-16, and 18-24 are in condition for allowance.

Claims 6 and 14 have been amended to recite, *inter alia*, "interpreting elements includes identifying abbreviated forms of the elements; and converting interpreted elements includes expanding the abbreviated forms of the elements." Support for these amendments may be found throughout the Applicants' specification and drawings (see, e.g., paragraph [0026]). Thus, no new matter has been entered by this amendment. O'Malley does not teach or suggest these features.

## CONCLUSION

It is believed that the foregoing amendments and remarks fully comply with the Office Action and that the claims herein should now be allowable to the Applicants. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance is requested. It is submitted that the foregoing amendments and remarks should render the case in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, as the cited references neither anticipate nor render obvious that which the Applicants deem to be the invention, it is respectfully requested that claims 1-24 be passed to issue.

If there are any additional charges with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP  
Applicants' Attorneys

By: /Marisa J. Dubuc/  
Marisa J. Dubuc  
Registration No. 46,673  
Customer No. 36192

Date: April 4, 2008  
Address: 55 Griffin Road South  
Bloomfield, CT 06002  
Telephone: (860) 286-2929  
Fax: (860) 286-0115